

# **Planning and Development Brief**

Station Area,  
Royal Leamington Spa  
**September 2008**

## **STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION**

Contacts:

Gill Griggs

**Tel:** 0121 609 8318

**Email:** [gill.griggs@gvagrimley.co.uk](mailto:gill.griggs@gvagrimley.co.uk)

## CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.	PRE-PRODUCTION CONSULTATION.....	2
3.	CONSULTATION ON DRAFT BRIEF .....	3
4.	SUMMARY.....	10

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1	SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AT THE LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS WORKSHOP SESSION
APPENDIX 2	LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION
APPENDIX 3	TABLE SETTING OUT ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED, THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE AND THE AMENDMENTS MADE TO THE BRIEF

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 GVA Grimley Limited were appointed by Warwick District Council to prepare a planning and development brief for the Station Area of Royal Leamington Spa. A draft of the brief was prepared for public consultation during Spring 2008 and was subsequently approved for consultation by the District Council's Executive Committee at the end of May. This was undertaken during June and July of this year in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
- 1.2 This report sets out the approach taken to consulting local stakeholders, statutory bodies and the general public. All responses received from this exercise have been carefully analysed and summarised within this report. The way in which the final draft of the brief has responded to the issues raised during the consultation is also set out for completeness.

## 2. Pre-Production Consultation

- 2.1 Pre-production consultation in connection with the brief involved discussions with officers from within Warwick District Council, Warwickshire County Council, and local stakeholders, including landowners and tenants, local amenity groups and business representatives.
- 2.2 Regular steering group meetings with officers of the District and County Council were held through the pre-production phase. The group discussed the results of the technical surveys, the issues raised from discussions with local stakeholders, and the drafting of the brief.
- 2.3 At the same time, contact was made with all landowners within the defined Station Brief Area informing them of the work being undertaken. Meetings and discussions were held with all the landowners and most tenants to discuss their future plans and aspirations for their land, along with their views on the constraints and opportunities that affected the area. This included discussions with representatives of Ford, Chiltern Railways, Stagecoach, Network Rail and Travis Perkins.
- 2.4 An evening workshop session was also held at the Town Hall for local amenity and business groups, along with ward members of the District and Town Councils. The following bodies were represented:
- Royal Leamington Spa Town Council;
  - The Leamington Society;
  - Central Leamington Area Residents Association;
  - Old Town Business Association;
  - Leamington Chamber of Trade; and,
  - Town Centre Management Initiative.
- 2.5 Following a brief presentation, the representatives were invited to form groups in which they discussed the area and identified the key issues they wished the brief to address. A summary of the issues raised is set out in Appendix One.
- 2.6 All the comments received during the pre-production stage helped to inform the content of the draft brief.

### 3. Consultation on Draft Brief

- 3.1 A six week consultation period on the Draft Brief was held between Friday 13th June and Friday 25th July 2008. The consultation was advertised in the local media and a press release was issued to the local press and radio. It was launched at an all day Exhibition Event at the Royal Priors Shopping Centre on Sunday 15th June where display boards and material was available for the public to view. Representatives from GVA Grimley and the District Council were available to discuss matters and answer any questions. Approximately 172 people visited the exhibition and many completed feedback forms or took them away to complete at home.
- 3.2 The draft brief was placed in ten locations in Warwick, Leamington, Kenilworth and Whitnash and full details were put onto the Council's web site. The consultation was also advertised at the Leamington Railway Station and summary leaflets were made available to travellers. Letters were sent out to statutory consultees and all landowners/tenants and local amenity/business groups informing them of the consultation. An "email alert" was also issued to those subscribing to the service.
- 3.3 During the consultation period, representatives of the District Council attended a number of meetings with local stakeholders to present the draft brief and answer any questions. These included Leamington Town Council, the Leamington Town Centre Management Initiative and the Conservation Area Advisory Forum.
- 3.4 A total of 72 representations were received following the consultation exercise which was considered a good level of response. The majority of the landowners and tenants responded to the consultation, including Ford, Chiltern Railways and Stagecoach. The key statutory consultees and local amenity and interest groups also commented. All the respondents are listed in Appendix Two and were made up as follows:
- 9 Landowners/Tenants;
  - 8 Statutory Consultees;
  - 2 Town/Parish Councils;
  - 1 District Councillor;
  - 10 Amenity/Interest Groups; and,
  - 42 Businesses/Members of the Public.

## Overview of the Representations

- 3.5 The representations were on the whole supportive of the draft brief and its framework for the future redevelopment of the area. The majority of the responses agreed with the proposed land uses identified for the various parcels of land, in particular the proposed mixed uses for the former Foundry site. There was, however, significant objection to the proposed commercial development on the south east corner of the station forecourt.
- 3.6 The comments on the development principles varied in their nature. Some responses addressed matters of detail which would be more appropriate considerations for the detailed planning stage, such as the design and layout of development. A large number of responses related to transport matters, with particular comments on improving access to the Station, new cycle routes and improving roads within the surrounding area. Further detailed transportation work will be required at the detailed planning stage to respond to some of the issues raised put forward by respondents. The draft brief's proposals for renewable and low carbon energy also generated a number of comments.
- 3.7 The representations on the Draft Brief are summarised below:

Section of the Brief	Summary of Representations
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The planning status of the brief is not clear.</li></ul>
Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>More emphasis needed on improvements to access to the station, urban design, sustainability, and designated areas.</li></ul>
Generic Development Principles (Transport Matters)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Guidance needs strengthening with reference to the need for detailed investigation of proposals impacts on the road network due to the interaction between existing routes, the need for improvements to local roads, the use of robust travel plans as a means of mitigating such impacts, and the need to maintain and improve pedestrian and cycle routes within and surrounding the Station Area.</li><li>Brief should include a new link across the railway for vehicles and pedestrians.</li><li>Brief should not rely on Park and Ride as a means of mitigating traffic impact due to uncertainty of delivery.</li><li>Mixed views on level of parking that should be provided, some responded it should be reduced due to proximity of the station, others suggest it should be sufficient to avoid parking on surrounding streets.</li></ul>
Generic Development Principles (Sustainability)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some respondents requested higher standards be achieved in terms of sustainable design and renewable energy, although others warned of the impact of such proposals on feasibility and viability of development.</li></ul>

Section of the Brief	Summary of Representations
and Design)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance on the energy centre should not preclude the use of biomass or its siting on alternative locations. Other renewable options should be considered.</li> <li>More detailed design guidelines should be prepared.</li> <li>Support for increased tree planting and landscape guidance for the area.</li> </ul>
Generic Development Principles (Environment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for ecological species surveys and archaeological studies at the detailed planning stage.</li> <li>Guidance must include reference to sustainable drainage systems and the need to adapt for climate change</li> </ul>
Former Foundry Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the brief's development principles and the flexibility of mixed uses.</li> <li>Concern regarding scale of retail uses supported on the site and impact on the town centres.</li> <li>Some support for other non-employment uses, such as energy plant and leisure uses.</li> <li>Support for residential development but concern regarding the potential environment for residents and contamination issues.</li> <li>Need for landmark buildings and strong design.</li> </ul>
Former Ford Car Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for low intensity employment uses.</li> <li>Concern about access arrangements with Princes Drive.</li> <li>Brief should support the use of this area for the re-located bus depot or trade centre uses.</li> </ul>
Railway Triangle Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for ecological area and improvements to access.</li> <li>Concern regarding compatibility of energy centre and ecology.</li> <li>One respondent supported office uses.</li> </ul>
Old Warwick Road Frontage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for development principles and employment generating uses.</li> <li>The canal should be incorporated within the development through re-location of the Old Warwick Road.</li> <li>Brief should support re-location of existing businesses to other suitable sites, including north of the railway.</li> </ul>
Railway Station Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the provision of a multi-storey car park to the west of the main station building, although its capacity should be at least 500 spaces and it should not block integration with development to the west along Old Warwick Road.</li> <li>Support for improvements to access between bus and rail, although location and design needs to be considered as part of a review of the Station Forecourt area to consider all users access requirements and parking issues.</li> <li>Objection to the commercial development of the railway station forecourt due to loss of operational railway land, and impact on the listed building and station gardens.</li> <li>Objection to a new northern entrance to the station from the station operator and rail bodies due to feasibility of implementation, security and operation issues for the station, additional costs, highway</li> </ul>

Section of the Brief	Summary of Representations
	<p>issues and weakening the importance of the southern entrance. Other respondents support the northern entrance and improvements to the existing underpass to encourage access to the town centre by foot and cycle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to the use of land north of the railway station for commercial development by the rail bodies as it should be retained for railway uses, including station car parking. Others support development that improves safety provided it does not adversely affect the neighbouring properties.</li> </ul>
Land North of the Railway off Station Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding the relationship between uses and the ability to deliver comprehensive redevelopment which does not involve re-locating the bus depot. The brief must therefore provide clear guidance on delivery, including the potential re-location of the bus depot.</li> <li>• Support for housing development, including social housing, and higher densities with building heights of 2 to 3 storey.</li> <li>• Also, support for commercial development if the bus depot is not re-located.</li> <li>• Improved access required, including potential links with Park Drive.</li> </ul>
Way Forward (Delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief should provide guidance on how the proposals will be delivered and how the Council will assist in the process.</li> </ul>
Land not included within the brief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request for inclusion of Lower Avenue and Bath Place Car Park.</li> <li>• Request for inclusion of the County Council Waste Depot.</li> </ul>

## The Council's Response to Representations

3.8 Tables 1 to 5 in Appendix Three list each of the representations made to the consultation (left hand column) and the Council's response (middle column), with proposed amendments to the brief (right hand column). Representations from key stakeholders (landowners and statutory consultees and bodies) are highlighted in bold. All other comments listed are made by groups, businesses and members of the public.

3.9 A number of amendments have been made to the Draft Brief to address comments made by respondents. The most significant amendment has been the deletion of the proposed commercial development within the Station forecourt. The brief has also incorporated a section on delivery issues, along with strengthening guidance on transportation and design matters. Other amendments have been made on matters of detail and where necessary extra clarity has been provided.

3.10 A summary of the key amendments made to the brief are summarised overleaf:



Section of the Brief	Summary of Amendments
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity on the planning status of the brief has been provided.</li> <li>Details of the consultation exercise have been deleted and replaced with a summary of the output from the consultation.</li> </ul>
Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Vision has been strengthened by reference to improvements to access to the station, urban design, protecting designated areas, and sustainability objectives.</li> </ul>
Policy Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference has been included in the brief to the Council's current Supplementary Planning Documents.</li> </ul>
Generic Development Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance on sustainability and the need to address climate change have been clarified with reference to sustainable construction, energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable urban drainage.</li> <li>Transport matters have been strengthened with particular reference to the responses of the County Council and Highways Agency. This has therefore been expanded to contain reference to the need for detailed transport assessments, the use of robust travel plans and the need for contributions towards improvements to access to the railway station as identified within the emerging Station Travel Plan. This document is being prepared by the County Council as part of a national project to encourage greater use of railway stations by sustainable means of transport.</li> <li>Guidance in relation to protecting, and enhancing where possible, designated features of the historic and natural environment within and around the site has been included.</li> </ul>
Former Foundry Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The text of the brief has been expanded to make it clear that only small scale retail and leisure uses that would support the office use and not harm the town centre are supported on the Foundry site.</li> </ul>
Former Ford Car Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The brief has been expanded to confirm the Council would support the re-location of the bus depot and/or trade centre uses to this site, subject to the provision of a satisfactory means of access to Princes Drive and an acceptable relationship between development and the adjoining properties to the rear of the site.</li> </ul>
Railway Triangle Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No amendments.</li> </ul>
Old Warwick Road Frontage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification has been provided to confirm that redevelopment will be subject to the re-location of existing uses to suitable alternative sites.</li> <li>Greater reference has been made to improving linkages, including investigating the possibility of a footpath/cycle link across the railway to connect with routes to the north.</li> </ul>
Railway Station Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The brief has made reference to the proposed Station Travel Plan which is to be developed by the County Council. This will identify a range of proposals to improve access to the station and encourage increased use of its services. Future developments within this area will need to be brought forward in accordance with the Plan.</li> <li>Support for increasing car parking is maintained within the brief, although new text has been added to ensure any proposals protect</li> </ul>

Section of the Brief	Summary of Amendments
	<p>the setting of the listed building. The brief has also been expanded to make it clear that the amount of car parking to be provided will need to be determined at the detailed planning stage with regard to visual and highway impacts, and consistency with the Station Travel Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful consideration has been given to the issue of providing a northern entrance to the station, particularly in light of the strong comments received from the rail bodies. The brief has been amended to acknowledge the concerns raised over costs and delivery, whilst also recognising the importance of providing a link to improve access and capacity of the station. However, the redevelopment of the Station Area represents a significant opportunity to deliver this important proposal for the town. The brief therefore refers to the Council's support and encouragement for the northern entrance, although recognising improvements to the underpass being required in the short term.</li> <li>Guidance on the use of land to the north of the station has been expanded. Clearer reference has been made to encouraging access to Lower Avenue to link with the Cultural Quarter and the Town Centre. The brief has been amended to provide guidance on possible use of this area for station car parking and 'other' development, such as residential and commercial uses. Reference has been given to improving the use of this area, protecting the setting of the Conservation Area, along with the amenity of adjoining properties.</li> <li>The proposals for the commercial development on the south east corner of the Station forecourt have been deleted from the brief. However, greater reference has been made to the need for rationalisation of the existing uses on the forecourt to improve access for users and provide better integration between buses and the station. The potential for incorporating some public space and/or public art within the improvements is also highlighted.</li> </ul>
Land North of the Railway off Station Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification has been provided as to the significance of the bus depot operation and its associated environmental impacts.</li> <li>Further guidance has been provided regarding the residential redevelopment of this area, with particular reference to protecting and enhancing the Conservation Area and investigating the potential for a linkage through to Park Drive.</li> <li>The brief has re-affirmed its support for the existing mixed use (residential and business) redevelopment and the comprehensive residential redevelopment of this area.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The text in this section has been amended to clarify the use of the West Midlands Checklist and how it has informed the proposals within the brief. The guidance on energy has also been amended to clarify that this is guidance for developers on how they might address this issue and is not prescriptive.</li> </ul>
Way Forward (Delivery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been re-drafted to provide guidance on how development is expected to come forward and how the Council intends to assist in the process, with reference to establishing a working group of key partners to identify and resolve issues regarding delivery and implementation, undertaking further analysis and preparing guidance as appropriate, and monitoring and reviewing progress.</li> </ul>

---

Section of the Brief	Summary of Amendments
Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Minor amendments have been made to the plans to correct details and update in line with the brief. The indicative proposals for the Station forecourt have been deleted as this will be considered in more detail through the emerging Station Travel Plan.</li></ul>

## 4. Summary

- 4.1 This report has set out the approach taken to consulting local stakeholders, statutory bodies and the general public on the planning and development brief for the Station Area. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement during June and July of this year.
- 4.2 Pre-production consultation in connection with the brief involved discussions with officers from within Warwick District Council, Warwickshire County Council, and local stakeholders, including landowners and tenants, local amenity groups and business representatives. This included meetings and discussions with all landowners to discuss their future plans and aspirations for their land. An evening workshop session was also held at the Town Hall for local amenity and business groups, along with ward members of the District and Town Councils, to identify the key issues for the brief to address.
- 4.3 Following the preparation of the draft brief, a six week consultation period was held between Friday 13th June and Friday 25th July 2008. It was launched at an all day Exhibition Event at the Royal Priors Shopping Centre on Sunday 15th June where display boards and material was available for the public to view. Approximately 172 people visited the exhibition. In addition, during the consultation period, representatives of the District Council attended a number of meetings with local stakeholders to present the draft brief and answer any questions.
- 4.4 The consultation generated a total of 72 representations which was considered a good level of response. The majority of the landowners and key statutory consultees and local amenity and interest groups commented. All responses received from this exercise were carefully analysed and summarised within this report. The representations were on the whole supportive of the draft brief and its framework for the future redevelopment of the area. The majority of the responses agreed with the proposed land uses identified for the various parcels of land, in particular the proposed mixed uses for the former Foundry site. The final version of the brief has been amended to respond to many of the comments raised through this exercise and address points of clarification.
- 4.5 The process of consultation has been a successful exercise. A large number of people have been made aware of the proposals and responded to the consultation exercise. This has helped to improve the content and quality of the final brief.

## **Appendix One – Output from Local Stakeholder Workshop Sessions**

### **Group 1 – Key Issues and Ideas Noted**

- Impact on local roads, particularly Avenue Road;
- Linkages for people entering the town – ‘Transport Hub’;
- Bus Interchange/routes in the area;
- Canal frontage/opportunities;
- ‘Shops – old town’. Retail component needs consideration;
- Making the station more interactive/accessible;
- Eyesore – remove Ford foundry;
- Leisure – link into town centre – indoor bowling area;
- Multi-use sports facility/area;
- ‘IT’ industry development;
- Old foundry – museum;
- Light industry;
- Education potential relocated to Old Town; and,
- Residential/houses - issue of proximity to rail lines.

### **Group 2 – Key Issues and Ideas Noted**

- Links to Station Area from Old Town;
  - Along Canal and Clemens St/High St;
  - Lower Avenue ‘canyon’ (divides area);
  - Into Bath Place area;
- Bridge for pedestrian/cycles over Lower Avenue;
- Car park clutter at Station Frontage;
- Once in a century opportunity;
- Parking south of station (Old Warwick Road area) and walk rather than park & ride;
- Coach parking for tourist coaches;
- High value employment;

- Remediation needed of parts of site if residential;
- Access to triangle between 2 rail lines is needed;
- Residential north of railway but not at eastern end; and,
- Offices and employment on south side of railway.

### **Group 3 – Key Issues and Ideas Noted**

- Vehicular congestion and the general permeability of the site moving North to South;
- Parking provision should be predominantly placed to the south and be accessed off Old Warwick Rd;
- The Station forecourt should be re-organised to include a multi-deck car park, coach parking for tourists and a bus/rail interchange area;
- Built form on the corner of Old Warwick Road and Lower Avenue would encourage a greater association with the Old Town and assist its regeneration;
- Pedestrian-only access should be encouraged to the North of the station;
- New public square to the north linked to Station Approach. The public square should also include a pedestrian link to Lower Avenue and have possible cultural uses surrounding it;
- A new pedestrian cycle route should be considered through the Ford Foundry Works, linking Victoria Park to the canal (possibly terminating in a new canal marina);
- The possible uses for the railway land include a park, office or a district heating system;
- Ford Foundry site should include a significant landmark building, providing an appropriate gateway for the town;
- Built form along the Old Warwick Road should be encouraged to establish a strong building line;
- Access to the site of the former Ford Works car park, should be via Homebase or the car dealership off the Myton Road;
- It was accepted that the remaining land to the North and West could be residential in use but not apartments. In addition, the Bus depot should be found an alternative site, possibly off Old Warwick Road; and,
- It was also questioned whether or not the waste disposal area off Princess Drive should be included within the brief, and found an alternative site.

## **APPENDIX TWO – RESPONSES TO DRAFT BRIEF**

### **Landowners (9)**

Cushman & Wakefield LLP on behalf of Ford Motor Company  
Atisreal Ltd on behalf of Travis Perkins  
Chiltern Railways  
Network Rail  
London Midland  
Montagu Evans on behalf of Stagecoach  
GR Planning Consultancy on behalf of Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd & BRB (Residuary) Ltd  
Innes England on behalf of Pendragon plc  
Paul Meggitt on behalf of the Kingdom Hall

### **Statutory Consultees (8)**

Advantage West Midlands  
Warwickshire County Council  
English Heritage  
Natural England  
Highways Agency  
Warwickshire Police  
British Waterways  
Countryside Recreation – Warwickshire County Council

### **Town/Parish Councils (2)**

The Town Council of Royal Leamington Spa  
Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council

### **Councillors (1)**

Councillor Higgins

### **Interest Groups/Amenity Societies (10)**

The Leamington Society, Central Leamington Residents Association and the Friends of Leamington Station  
Old Town Business Association  
Leamington Spa Transition Town Steering Group  
The Ramblers Association  
Cycleways  
Action 21  
Solihull & Leamington Rail Users Association  
Living Streets  
Green Party  
Warwickshire Gardens Trust

### **Members of the Public/Businesses (41)**

Roger Cadbury  
Simon Eddleston  
Barbara Crowther  
Mrs Angela Whitworth  
Neville Davenport  
Nigel and Barbara Hutchinson  
Phil Galpin  
Michael O'Connell for Europa Way Consortium  
Malcolm Baxter  
Nichole Alexander  
Framptons Planning on behalf of Opus Land Ltd  
Andrew Patrick, SDC Member for Bishops Itchington, Chesterton & Harbury  
Andy Patrick  
Charles Gardner

Malcolm Burns  
Steve and Allison Jackson  
Geoffrey Holroyde  
Lee Thomas & Amanda Smyth  
Nigel Rock, Ward Member for Stockton & Napton  
Giles Nursey  
David Williams  
Clare Hinton  
Alan Norrie  
Trevor Daw  
Phil Hall  
W Lovell  
Helen Bland  
Nigel Briggs  
Daid Stowell  
Derek Booth  
Geoffrey Holroyde  
Elizabeth Dinsdale  
Richard Drew  
Jennifer Drake  
Roger McEvoy  
Mr R P Taylor  
B McArthur  
Mr J H Grainger  
R Rountain  
Jon Kiteley  
Anonymous



### APPENDIX THREE: Table 1 Summary of General Comments made on the Draft Brief and the Council's Response

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<b>Issue – Vision and Principles</b>		
The vision should make reference to the need to improve the station as a transport interchange and pedestrian and cycle routes.	Agree that more explicit reference should be made to improvements to access to the station in the vision.	The vision has been amended to include reference to improvements to access to the station.
The vision should set high standards in urban design and sustainable forms of development.	Agree that reference should be made to urban design and sustainability in the vision.	The vision has been amended to include reference to high quality design and sustainability issues, such as low carbon economy and climate change.
The vision and generic development principles should strengthen the commitment to high quality landscaping and protection of designated areas.	Agree that reference should be made to protection of designated areas.	The vision has been amended to include reference to preserving and enhancing the historic environment.
<b>Issue – Economy and Employment</b>		
<b>AWM</b> see developing and maximising the local knowledge base through providing opportunities for extant businesses and new business spin-outs from Coventry and Warwick Universities as important for the town's economic success. They support the B1 office and research and development allocations in providing requirements that cannot be accommodated within the town and providing sites for a wider choice of smaller units for start-up and businesses retention. They are also pleased to see potential education and technology park uses given their proximity to areas of economic and training need.	Noted	No change required.
The office space should include small offices and business incubator units as there is a shortage in the town.	The scale and nature of any office development will need to be considered at the detailed planning stage having regard to the scheme design and demand/viability considerations. It is noted there are proposals supported by AWM for a business incubation centre elsewhere within the Old Town.	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
Support for the creation of local employment for skilled and semi-skilled workers displaced by the closure of Ford.	Noted	No change required.
More office space is not needed within the town.	The emerging RSS identifies a need for growth in offices within Leamington and this is recognised by the Regional Economic Development Agency, AWM, in its response to the draft brief.	No change required.
<b>Issue – Housing</b>		
All of this area should be used for housing and wildlife to meet future needs.	Planning policy advocates the need to create balanced communities with homes, jobs, shops and leisure close together and therefore it is appropriate to include a mix of uses across the area. Land to the south of the railway is protected employment land and more appropriate in urban design terms for larger scale non domestic development which would make good use of this accessible location.	No change required.
Need to deliver more apartments to meet future housing needs in this accessible location.	The exact split between houses and apartments will need to be considered at the detailed planning stage. Apartments will be appropriate as part of a mix of house types across the area and indeed have been identified within the brief. However, in accordance with the Council's <i>'Development Control Guidance: Achieving a Mix of Housing'</i> , a proportion of 2 and 3 bed houses are required to meet identified housing need and therefore increasing the number of apartments may not be appropriate.	No change required.
Need to increase housing density.	The housing density will need to be determined at the detailed planning stage having regard to factors such as the location's accessibility by public transport and the character and	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
	appearance of the surrounding area.	
Need to increase housing density through reducing land for car parking.	Parking will need to be provided in accordance with the Local Plan and the Council's SPD. However, as a general principle, it is appropriate to reduce parking provision in central locations with high levels of public transport availability provided there is no adverse impact on on-street parking. Reference has been included within the Generic Development Principles.	No change required.
Support a social mix of housing within the area.	Affordable housing will need to be provided in accordance with the Local Plan and the Council's SPD. This will require a mix of social and market housing.	No change required.
<b>Issue – Sustainability and Energy</b>		
<b>AWM</b> support the development principles, such as the use of the Sustainability Checklist.	Noted	No change required.
<b>WCC</b> would like alternative renewable energy options outlined in the brief.	The various renewable energy options have been outlined in the technical supporting document dealing with low/zero carbon technologies appraisal and the most appropriate options have been listed within the brief.	No change required.
Principles of sustainable development must not place unacceptable restrictions or affect the technical feasibility or commercial viability of a scheme coming forward.	Noted, however, the purpose of planning is to deliver sustainable development and applicants will need to adequately demonstrate how such principles can be achieved on this site in accordance with national and local planning policies.	No change required.
New residential development should achieve Code Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.	There is no policy basis as yet to require Code Level 6 for new residential development, although the Government is committed to achieving this in terms of energy/carbon	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
	performance by 2016. It is expected that new policy guidance will be in place by that time.	
All buildings should be zero carbon.	There is no policy basis as yet to require all buildings to be zero carbon although the Government is committed to achieving this by 2016. It is expected that new policy guidance will be in place by that time.	No change required.
Option to use the energy centre for biomass should not be dismissed as air quality may improve in the future.	Agreed and the brief does not rule out the potential for biomass. However, the impact on local air quality is an issue that cannot be ignored and is therefore highlighted within the brief.	No change required.
Energy centre should be a biofuel based system and located close to the rail marshalling area for ease of access for supplies by rail.		
Energy centre should be located to the south of the railway line.	The most technically suitable location for the energy centre, ignoring all other factors, is central to the site. However, good vehicle access is required for potential fuel delivery and proximity to other uses are factors which need to be taken into account. The location proposed in the brief is considered appropriate and makes good use of land which has limited potential for other types of development. Other sites may also be appropriate.	The brief has been amended to recognise that other locations for the energy centre may also be appropriate.
Wind Turbines should be re-visited as an option for the site.	Wind does not provide a viable energy source for this scale of development unless a large turbine is constructed which would be likely to raise unacceptable visual and noise impacts.	No change required.
Development will need to respond to the challenges of climate change and fossil fuel depletion.	Agreed. The brief outlines the need to maximise the potential to install renewable energy supply technologies and improve energy efficiency.	No change required.
Suggest establishing a sustainability officer for the area.	The need for this role is not clear and considered not appropriate at this stage.	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<b>Issue – Design and Townscape Matters</b>		
<p><b>English Heritage</b> welcome the focus on urban design and conservation excellence and note there is much to applaud in the draft brief. It notes as follows:</p> <p>A design statement of greater detail will be required to set out how the proposals respond to the identity of the town and its significant historic townscape, industrial heritage, the foundry, station, canal, conservation area and historic parks. New landmark buildings should not compete with the character and identity of these features.</p> <p>A critical evaluation/audit of the quality of the existing environment (public realm and streetscape) should be undertaken, looking critically at highway layout and the opportunity to make streets more civilised spaces. The potential for a clutter of new signs, boundary treatments, etc. must also be carefully managed. A design code for the management of the public realm as well as buildings might also be considered.</p>	<p>The need to prepare a design statement and design code to inform proposals will be considered by the Council through the delivery phase.</p>	<p>Reference to the potential production of these documents has been included within the 'Way Forward' section.</p>
Good architectural design is required, streetscape and landscape design is also important.	Noted	No change required.
Support open space and use of canal if possible.	Noted. The integration of the canal with development is problematic given the location of the Old Warwick Road and the significant tree belt along the canal path's northern edge, although the brief identifies the need to improve linkages with the canal from new development.	No change required.
Need to provide tree lined routes along the rail and road corridors.	Noted, the brief includes reference to creating new linear blocks of trees and shrub planting to screen the railway corridor.	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<b>WCC</b> support a landscape vocabulary for the whole site.	The need to prepare a landscape vocabulary to inform proposals for the site will be considered by the Council through the delivery phase.	Reference to the potential production of further design guidance has been included within the 'Way Forward' section.
Opportunity to improve signage and include public art within the area.	Agree.	The opportunity to provide public art within the Station Area has been identified within the brief.
<b>Warwickshire Police</b> support the proposals, and request all development incorporates 'Secure by Design' standard.	Noted. The development principles require the design and layout of new development to be 'safe' and there is no need for specific reference to Secure by Design.	No change required.
<b>Transport Issue – Impact on Local Roads</b>		
<b>Highways Agency</b> are concerned regarding impact of development on congestion at M40 Junction 14. This impact can however be offset by the rigorous application of effective, target-driven Travel Plans for each of the developments on the site. Furthermore, an opportunity exists for an area-wide travel plan. They also note the opportunity to explore a high occupancy vehicle lane from the M40 junction.	Noted. The brief should make reference to target-driven travel plans for each of the sites. The need to prepare an area wide travel plan to inform proposals will be considered by the Council through the delivery phase. The opportunity for a high occupancy vehicle lane should be explored further by the highway authorities.	Reference to target-driven travel plans has been included within the generic development principles. Reference to an 'area-wide travel plan' has been included within the 'Way Forward' section of the final brief.
<b>WCC</b> The brief must acknowledge that traffic issues around the site cannot be looked at in isolation and there is a high degree of interaction between all main routes. In particular, Princes Drive, Europa Way, Old Warwick Road and Adelaide Road need to be the focus for improvements. Air quality issues arising from traffic must also be addressed within the AQMA at High Street/Bath Street. Longer term investigations are underway to address a range of transport issues in the area. Development must aim to minimise congestion whilst providing safe and efficient routes.	The brief should make reference to the degree of interaction between the main routes and the need to consider traffic impacts across a wide area.  The output and results from the ongoing investigations being undertaken by the County Council can inform the detailed planning stage.	Greater reference has been made to traffic issues and interactions within the generic development principles.
<b>Town Council</b> wish to see opportunities to improve Princes Drive and Lower Avenue to be taken and ongoing dialogue	Noted. Any improvements would need to be subject to detailed design and feasibility work.	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
is required with the County Council.	These comments will be passed onto the County Council Highway Planners undertaking the current transport investigations and can inform the delivery phase.	
<b>CLARA/Leamington Society/OTBA</b> wish the opportunity to be taken by the County Council to review road layouts to alleviate congestion, particularly Lower Avenue with the potential for traffic calming and pedestrian crossing.		
Need to improve pedestrian access along Lower Avenue.		
Proposals should have adequate roads and access and not rely on nearby roads, such as York Road which should be closed at one end.	Agreed that proposals should have adequate highway access and this is recognised within the brief. The highway impact of proposals on York Road and the need for mitigation would need to be considered at the detailed planning stage.	No change required.
Development offers the opportunity to address traffic congestion and fund improvements, and this should be recognised in the brief.	Agreed	Reference has been included within the 'key opportunities' section of the brief.
<b>Transport Issue – New Routes</b>		
Need to include the potential for a new road link across the railway connecting Adelaide Road with Old Warwick Road to relief traffic congestion on existing routes.	The provision of a road link for vehicles between Adelaide Road and Old Warwick Road across the railway would be a significant piece of highway infrastructure that would sterilise a large area of land from development. It would place a significant cost on development and would also potentially require the compulsory purchase of land and businesses. A full feasibility study would be required and there would also be potential visual impacts on the nearby designated areas and buildings if the link was a bridge over the railway. Whilst such a proposal would relieve congestion on Princes Drive and Park Road, it may encourage more travel by car contrary to planning policies. The merits of the proposal are not therefore	Reference has been included to the need to explore the potential of a pedestrian link across the railway as part of the development principles for the Old Warwick Road frontage.
Need to include a pedestrian/cycle/bus link across railway in the centre of the site.		
The provision of a bridge across the railway line would improve access to the station from new housing to the north.		

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
	<p>considered sufficient to outweigh the costs.</p> <p>The provision of a pedestrian link associated with the redevelopment of the Old Warwick Road frontage could have some merit in providing an alternative route to the north and the town centre for users of the development. This would potentially discourage unnecessary car use, however, the feasibility and cost of providing such a link would need to be investigated further at the detailed planning stage.</p>	
<b>Transport Issue – Cycle and Pedestrian Access</b>		
<p><b>WCC</b> note the National Cycle Route needs improving and the provision of a link between Old Warwick Road and Warwick New Road along Princes Drive would be desirable with improved crossings at both ends of Princes Drive.</p>	<p>Noted. Any improvements would need to be subject to detailed design and feasibility work, although opportunities have been highlighted within the brief area.</p> <p>The detailed comments will be passed onto the County Council Highway Planners undertaking the current transport investigations and can inform the detailed planning stage.</p>	<p>Greater reference to improvements to cycle linkages has been included with the Development Principles.</p>
<p>Need to improve facilities for cyclists, including providing a link that connects Warwick New Road cycle route with the Old Town area. This should be via a new route along Princes Drive and to the north of the railway line between Park Drive and Lower Avenue.</p>		
<p>Need to improve route of the Sustrans National Cycle Route.</p>		
<p><b>Old Town Business Association</b> note need for improvements for safe crossing points along Princes Drive and at its junction with Park Drive/Victoria Park.</p>		



Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
The existing footpath through the site linking Avenue Road to Old Warwick Road via the underpass must be protected and, if possible, enhanced.	Agreed. The brief should recognise the need for improving the existing underpass.	Reference has been included within the Railway Station area to enhancing the existing underpass.
Development should create an attractive route to the town centre.	Agreed.	Reference has been included within the Railway Station area to improving access for pedestrians and cycles to the north of the railway.
<b>Transport Issue – Parking Provision</b>		
<b>WCC</b> require that parking should avoid the displacement of vehicles onto residential streets where possible and look to encourage 'green' travel opportunities.	Agreed. Reference has been included within the Generic Development Principles and parking will need to be provided in accordance with the Local Plan and the Council's SPD.	No change required.
<b>OTBA</b> note new residential units must have realistic parking allocations	Noted.	No change required.
Some of the residential units should have no parking.	Agreed. There could be opportunities to provide no parking as long as there are realistic travel alternatives but this would need to be assessed at the detailed planning stage.	No change required.
Parking should be underground in order to maximise density of development.	This is a detailed design consideration for the developer.	No change required.
Support for good quality cycle parking.	Agreed.	No change required.
<b>Transport Issue – Park and Ride</b>		
<b>Bishops Tachbrook PC</b> and others note the guidance within the brief on transport and parking should not rely upon the Park and Ride facility at Grey's Mallory (Bishops Tachbrook Parish Council).	The approach within the brief to mitigating traffic impact from new development does not rely on implementation of the Park and Ride facility, although it recognises the potential opportunity it presents.	No change required.
Do not support contributions towards park and ride as it is unsustainable.	The sustainability of the park and ride facility has been considered through the Local Transport Plan and Local Plan process.	No change required.
Contributions should be sought towards improving cycle and pedestrian links in the area rather than Park and Ride.	The distribution of developer contributions will be considered at the detailed planning stage.	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
Transport Issue – Railway Land		
Town Council and others note that development should not inhibit future investment in the railway or rail projects.	Network Rail has been consulted on the draft brief and their views have been incorporated in relation to land north of the station.	The brief has been amended to recognise the potential need for land to the north of the station for rail use.
Issue – Ecology		
Natural England recommends that a design code be developed for the Station Area which addresses the environment, resource use and community issues.	The need to prepare a design statement and design code to inform proposals will be considered by the Council through the delivery phase.	Reference to the potential production of these documents has been included within the 'Way Forward' section.
WCC note that further detailed species surveys are required to inform the approach to mitigation.	Noted.	No change required.
Wildlife corridors could be incorporated along the pedestrian/cycle paths.	Noted. Reference is included within the Generic Development Principles.	No change required.
Issue – Archaeology		
English Heritage note there will be above and below ground remnants of value and existing structure of local historic interest should be retained to inform future development, and provide character and association to past activity.	Noted. There may be features and structures of historic interest within certain sites and this can be considered at the detailed planning stage.	Reference has been included within the Generic Development Principles to features of the historic environment.
WCC note that further archaeological fieldwork may be necessary prior to and during redevelopment.		
Issue – Drainage		
References to sustainable drainage systems should be made in the brief as well as the importance of new tree planting in respect of temperature reduction, improving sustainable drainage and air quality.	Agreed. Reference to sustainable drainage requirements should be made within the Development Principles.	Reference has been included within the Generic Development Principles.
Request for drainage improvements to be included in the proposals		
Issue – Delivery		
The brief should include a section on delivery and timescales for site clearance, removal of contamination.	Agreed. The means by which the Council can assist developers in delivering development	A section on delivery has been included within the 'Way Forward' section of the brief.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
planning and phasing of development.	should be included within the brief.	
The brief must be based on a realistic and market-led approach. It should provide a guide to what could be achieved but not be prescriptive to ensure delivery is not jeopardised.	The draft brief has been based upon a realistic and market-led approach.	No change required.
<b>Issue – Land outside of the Brief</b>		
The brief should include Lower Avenue and the Bath Place Car Park and railway arch businesses. <b>OTBA</b> note the potential for a multi-storey car park on Bath Place car park connected to the Station Area.	Noted. The indicative plans within the draft brief included reference to improvements to the car park area and this is recognised within the brief. The potential for a multi-storey car park would need to be subject to more detailed feasibility work.	The brief has been amended to recognise potential for improvements to the Bath Place Car Park.
<b>WCC</b> state there are no immediate plans to relocate the Waste site, although there may be opportunities to use part of the site for road widening/access improvements which could help the movement of traffic within the area.	The potential for the use of this site for highway improvements to Princes Drive is noted and reference should be included within the brief.	The potential for this area to provide land for highway improvements on Princes Drive has been referenced within the brief.
Potential to include the Household Waste site within the brief and to re-locate this existing facility elsewhere to provide an opportunity for light industrial uses/business park, freeing up land for housing on the former Ford Car Park	The potential for any redevelopment in the longer-term would need to be considered against the relevant planning policies at that time. Given the site's position in relation to the wider Station Area, there is no need for consideration of this site to form part of the brief.	
The proposals should consider the adjacent waste site for recreational uses or office/hotel development.		
Should consider including waterworks and waste treatment plant in order to enable improvements or expansion.		
Reference should be made to York Promenade and the Pump Room Gardens in the Policy Section.	Agreed.	Reference has been made in the Policy Section to the designated parks and gardens.

**Table 2 Summary of Comments Made in relation to the Former Ford Foundry Land and Council's Response**

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<b>Issue - Former Ford Foundry Site</b>		
<b>AWM</b> support the development principles for the site as it is a key opportunity for B1 offices and adds to the somewhat limited market offer within the town.	Noted.	No change required.
<b>Ford Motor Company</b> support a flexible approach enabling high value uses to maximise the site's potential provides the most suitable approach to redevelopment of this site.	The site is protected employment land in accordance with Policy SC2 of the Local Plan and this is acknowledged within the brief. The brief does, however, provide flexibility for introducing other uses as part of an employment-led mixed use redevelopment, recognising the particular circumstances of the site. This flexibility does not extend to introducing other high value uses, such as large scale retail development, as such an approach would be contrary to the development plan.	No change required.
<b>Town Council</b> support the development principles for this site, particularly the hotel and supporting commercial uses.	Noted.	No change required.
<b>WCC</b> concerned that retail should be limited and not have a negative impact on the vitality of the town centre.	The brief makes clear that any retail use would be ancillary to, and serve, the employment use and any impact on the vitality of the town centre would need to be assessed at the detailed planning stage.	The brief has been amended to clarify any retail uses would be small scale and included reference to the tests of PPS6.
<b>Other Comments:</b>		
The site should be used to develop a bio-digester to create renewable energy. Lack of children's indoor play areas in the town.	This would be contrary to Policy SC2 of the Local Plan and would not deliver the vision for the Station Area, in terms of providing high quality landmark buildings and supporting the economic regeneration of the Old Town area.	No change required.
Site should accommodate houses not flats and only limited retail.	The vision for this part of the Station Area is for high quality landmark buildings to provide a	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
	gateway to the town centre. This will require buildings of greater than domestic scale and therefore two storey housing would not be appropriate alongside commercial office development.	
The proposed residential uses would have an unacceptable environment given the location of the car park and need for servicing areas for the hotel and other uses.	This would be a matter for the detailed design, however, it is considered there is sufficient space to accommodate both uses satisfactorily.	No change required.
Concern over the impact of contamination on the Ford site affecting the residential properties.	Land contamination would need to be appropriately addressed as part of the redevelopment of the site. However, there is no evidence to suggest this would preclude residential use from this site.	No change required.
Clear demand for extra hotel space is needed in the town.	Noted. Market advice given indicates there would be interest in a hotel use on this site.	No change required.
Landmark building should incorporate a grand water feature to reflect the Spa history of the town.	The detailed design of the buildings will need to be considered at the planning application stage.	No change required.
Consider replacement tower feature for clock.		
The building heights need to avoid creating a battlement wall.		
Issue - Former Ford Car Park		
Town Council support low intensity employment development, subject to measures to address traffic impact on Princes Drive.	Noted.	No change required.
OTBA concerned at the use of the existing access and alternative access suggested through Homebase land or car dealership on Myton Road. Development of the Ford's Car Park site will add to congestion on Princes Drive which is already unsafe for cyclists.	A low intensity employment use of this land would minimise traffic use of the existing access and improvements may be required to include consideration for cyclists. Any alternative access arrangements could be acceptable in highway terms but would need the agreement of the highway authority and adjoining landowners where necessary.	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<b>Other comments:</b>		
The former Ford Car Park represents a possible ideal location for the existing Stagecoach bus depot and light industrial units.	The brief would not preclude this development from coming forward but a detailed study would be required in order to ascertain the suitability of the existing access for buses and the highway impacts of the proposed use. Impact on nearby residential properties would also need to be assessed.	The brief has been amended to clarify the Council's support in principle for this use subject to highway and amenity issues being resolved.
<b>Issue - Railway Triangle Land</b>		
Support for ecological area and enhancing existing green spaces.	Noted	No change required.
The railway triangle offers opportunities for controlled public access, some tree felling and planting of native species, and creation of a pond and nature trail.	Agreed. The brief provides a context for such use of this area.	No change required.
Ecological area will become neglected and would be better built for offices.	Surveillance and security of this area will need to be considered at the detailed design stage. The proposed use of this land for offices is considered inappropriate due to the limited access with Princes Drive.	No change required.
<b>WCC</b> and others concern that an energy centre would not be a suitable 'next door neighbour' for a nature conservation area.	In principle, an energy centre can sit comfortably alongside a nature conservation area. However, the siting and design of any building and parking will need careful consideration at the detailed design stage.	No change required.
Need to ensure appropriate access arrangements and a dedicated cycle/pedestrian route along Princes Drive.	Agreed. The brief identifies the potential for a cycle/pedestrian link through the site along Princes Drive.	No change required.

**Table 3 Summary of Comments Made in relation to the Old Warwick Road Frontage and Council's Response**

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<b>Travis Perkins</b> supports the principles of mixed use development, subject to identification of suitable alternative location for its business. Welcomes the opportunity of further dialogue with the Council regarding this issue.	Noted. The brief recognises that the existing businesses would need to be re-located prior to the comprehensive redevelopment of this area. The willingness to continue dialogue with the Council is a matter addressed within the delivery phase.	The brief has been amended to clarify development would require the re-location of the existing uses.
<b>Town Council</b> endorse the approach to encourage further employment led mixed use of this site, recognising Leamington as a location for emerging technologies.	Noted	No change required.
<b>WCC</b> seek further research and evidence to substantiate proposals for offices and education/technology park given the profile/skill base of the Brunswick area. Potential to explore tourism/conferencing and leisure uses within this area.	The emerging RSS identifies a need for growth in offices within Leamington and this is recognised by the Regional Economic Development Agency, AWM, in its response to the draft brief. The site's accessibility by public transport and proximity to the Old Town area present an opportunity to encourage more education uses within the town. This could help support the population of the Brunswick Ward which is noted as being in the 30% most deprived wards in terms of education, skills and training. The potential for accommodating tourism/conferencing and leisure uses has been recognised with the identification of a hotel and leisure uses on the Foundry site within the brief.	No change required.
<b>CLARA/Leamington Society</b> support further housing within this area	Residential development of this area would be contrary to Policy SC2 of the Local Plan and would not be compatible with existing adjoining land uses. Increasing residential uses in this area would also not help to achieve the balance of uses across the Station Area and result in the	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
	loss of an opportunity to create high quality employment/education uses in a highly accessible location.	
<p><b>British Waterways</b> put forward a vision to deliver a water park development incorporating residential, leisure and office activity through the re-alignment of the Old Warwick Road to alongside the railway line, allowing development to link with the waterway and towpath.</p>	<p>The re-location of the Old Warwick Road would be a significant piece of highway infrastructure. It would place a significant cost on development and would potentially require the compulsory purchase of a number of land and businesses. A full feasibility study would be required and there would also be potential impacts on the setting of the listed station. Whilst such a proposal would enable development to overlook the canal and thereby potentially create a more attractive environment, it would also require the loss of a significant number of mature trees along the canal boundary. It is also noted that other better located proposals to make use of the Canalside are being explored within the Old Town area. The merits of the proposal are not therefore considered sufficient to outweigh the costs.</p>	
<b>Other Comments:</b>		
<p>Consideration should be given to the displacement of these businesses and most could be re-located to north of the railway line.</p>	<p>The brief recognises that the existing businesses would need to be re-located prior to the comprehensive redevelopment of this area. Their re-location to the north of the railway is unlikely to be attractive to them given its limited profile and poor access from the highway network. It would also be incompatible with the proposals to make the best use of this land and improve the quality of the character of the area through residential development.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>



---

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
Do not support re-location of existing businesses.	Noted. However, in land use planning terms these uses do not make best use of this highly sustainable location and other employment uses would be more appropriate.	No change required.
The trees on both sides of the Old Warwick Road should be kept as this is an attractive route.	Agreed. This matter will be addressed at the detailed design stage.	No change required.

**Table 4 Summary of Comments Made in relation to the Railway Station Area and Council's Response**

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<b>Issue – General</b>		
<b>Chiltern</b> support the focus on integrating the station with the regenerated area, the town centre and the wider region.	Noted	No action required.
<b>Network Rail</b> comment that any station improvements would have to look for developer contributions. The brief should therefore detail the pooling of planning obligations from developers to improve and facilitate station works.	Noted. The approach to funding improvements to the station through planning obligations from developers will need to be considered through the delivery phase.	The brief has included reference to 'pooling' developer contributions towards transport improvements within the 'way forward' section of the brief.
Support for proposals to increase car parking and improve access to the station.	Noted	No change required.
Suggest establishing car club and cycle hire at Station.	Noted. This proposal should be considered as part of the development of a Station Travel Plan by the County Council and the Station Operator.	Reference to the development of a Station Travel Plan is included within the brief.
<b>Issue – Proposed Multi-Deck Car Parking to South</b>		
<b>Chiltern</b> support the provision of a multi-deck car park to the south, although the proposed capacity should be increased to a minimum of 500 spaces.	The brief supports the principle of a multi-deck car park to the south of the station, however, its exact size will need to be determined at the detailed planning stage having regard to its design/visual impact, highway impact, and the availability of alternative parking, such as the Park and Ride facility. It should also be accompanied by a Station Travel Plan to demonstrate how the proposal fits in with other improvements planned or proposed to the Station.	The brief has been amended to clarify that the size of car be determined at the detailed planning stage.
<b>WCC</b> support an increase in parking at the Station to meet future demand, with the number of spaces needing to be reviewed. Multi-decked car park should be underground as far as possible to reduce visual impact. Should the Park and Ride facility come forward, there will be an opportunity to reduce the number of spaces.		
<b>CLARA/Leamington Society</b> support increasing car parking spaces to at least 500 cars.		
<b>Other comments:</b> Existing parking is insufficient and support for increasing car parking at Station.		
<b>London Midland</b> comment that staff parking is required at the station for its staff (25 spaces).	Noted. The design of the parking will need to take into account an appropriate level of staff	No change required.

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
	parking which is consistent with the Station Travel Plan.	
<b>AWM</b> welcome the proposed improvements to the railway station, including links to the Spencer's Yard cultural quarter. The decked car park should not become a barrier between the station and the education/technology park area to the west.	Agreed. The need to ensure the decked car park does not become a barrier between the station and the land to the west will need to be addressed at the detailed design stage.	The brief has been amended to ensure linkages with adjoining areas are not lost as a result of this proposal.
<b>Issue – Bus Interchange</b>		
<b>Chiltern</b> do not support the placement of a bus interchange between the car park and station building, which would inconvenience passengers and not make efficient use of forecourt space.	The need and provision of a bus interchange/parking area and its relationship with the station needs to be investigated further as part of the development of a Station Travel Plan.	The brief has been amended to clarify that improvements to the station forecourt and integration between buses and the station needs to be considered through the development of the Station Travel Plan.
<b>WCC</b> comment that the potential for a bus-rail interchange with pedestrian linkages could benefit the development but proposals for bus parking need further investigation alongside other requirements, including pedestrian/cycle access, parking and drop off.		
<b>CLARA/Leamington Society</b> do not support the suggested bus station facility as it is not on the main bus routes. However, need for improvements to improve accessibility of Station forecourt.		
<b>OTBA</b> support coach parking alongside railway station and public transport hub.		
<b>Other Comments:</b>		
Support for bus/rail interchange and wish to see this used by National Express services		
Bus parking is unnecessary as most routes do not pass station. Coach parking would be better provided in Newbold Terrace.		
<b>Issue – Development on Station Forecourt</b>		
<b>Chiltern</b> do not support loss of station forecourt to new commercial development and a bus interchange given	Agreed. The development of a commercial building on the south east corner of the	The brief has been amended to delete this proposal, however, reference to the potential

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<p>existing and future demand on this space by rail users. This should be retained in full for railway-related use and options for best use of the forecourt are being considered under the DfT's National Stations Improvement Programme.</p> <p>Furthermore, do not support commercial development as it would create a visual barrier between the High Street and the Station, compromising the setting of the listed building. It may also require major engineering works which might risk the integrity of the rail infrastructure and the setting of the gardens.</p> <p><b>WCC</b> do not support a commercial use on the corner of the forecourt as it would affect views and reduce capacity of the land for access improvements.</p> <p><b>English Heritage</b> comment that a case for development on the south east corner must be made, having regard to historic maps, positive precedents and the effect on the listed station and conservation area.</p> <p><b>Town Council</b> advocate leaving the station forecourt as it currently is but vehicular access and parking should be subject to more detailed investigation with the County Council.</p> <p><b>CLARA/Leamington Society</b> do not support a hotel use on the corner as it would be difficult to service, remove the view of the station affecting its setting and result in loss of the award winning station gardens.</p> <p><b>Solihull and Leamington Rail Users Association</b> do not support public square or hotel use to south of the Station as need to retain entrance and exit for safe vehicular use and views of the Station.</p> <p>Do not support hotel use in the south east corner as it may exacerbate air quality problems.</p>	<p>forecourt was included within the previous Supplementary Planning Guidance produced for this area in the late 1990's. Since that time, the Station building has been listed and its gardens restored. Whilst the introduction of a use in this corner may help to improve linkages with the High Street area, the harm to the setting of the listed building and its curtilage, notably the gardens, would be potentially significant. Furthermore, the development would result in the loss of railway land which is resisted by the station operator and Network Rail. In this context, the merits of the proposals are not considered sufficient to warrant including this proposal within the final brief.</p>	<p>for the provision of public space and/or public art within this area has been included to provide an opportunity to improve linkages with the High Street area.</p>

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
Commercial development should not be at the expense of bus access or car parking on the forecourt area.		
Strongly object to the new building on the corner of the forecourt on the grounds of its impact on the station gardens.		
Do not support the loss of the station garden, and would prefer sculptures of significance instead of buildings.		
Consider creation of a plaza in front of the Station with the Old Warwick Road passing underneath and the development of hotels, coffee shops overlooking the space.		
Potential for a café use to support the railway station.		
<b>Other Comments:</b>		
Designated cycle parking area is required.	The provision, siting and design of parking and access should be considered as part of the development of a Station Travel Plan.	The brief has been amended to clarify that improvements to the station forecourt and station parking needs to be considered through the development of the Station Travel Plan.
Areas for short stay parking and taxi waiting are required.		
Access arrangements need further consideration.		
<b>Issue – Northern Entrance</b>		
<b>Chiltern</b> do not support a northern entrance to the station for a number of reasons; including weakening the importance of the existing entrance that serves the town both now and in the future following the regeneration of the Ford site, highway access to the south entrance is more preferable than to the north, operational and security issues of having two entrances, financial cost of maintaining two entrances, feasibility of creating new subway which would be poor use of money. Support improving existing underpass and entrances with a public square and pedestrian link to Lower Avenue on land to the north.	There has been a rapid growth in rail travel in recent years and there is no evidence to suggest this trend will not continue. It is important therefore to identify and safeguard opportunities to maximise use of the existing rail network. The provision of a northern entrance would increase the capacity of the station to accommodate travellers and also make the station more attractive for users. This is particularly significant given the current poor state of the existing underpass.	The brief has been amended to reflect the potential of a northern entrance as a longer term solution to meet future need and demand, given the further feasibility and viability work required to inform the proposal. The brief also recognises that in the short to medium term improvements to the existing underpass will be required.
<b>Network Rail</b> state there is no operational or customer requirement for the northern entrance and funding should be directed to improving the existing underpass.	It is acknowledged that the feasibility and viability of the creation of a northern entrance	

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<p><b>English Heritage</b> state improving permeability is welcomed as this will ease pressure on the historic townscape, however the actual physical implications through the grade II listed station must be sensitively addressed.</p> <p><b>Town Council</b> support a northern entrance to the Railway Station and improvements to the existing underpass are required.</p> <p><b>CLARA/Leamington Society</b> support new northern entrance, but recognise funding issue and suggest reference to Local Transport Plan support.</p> <p><b>Solihull and Leamington Rail Users Association</b> do not support northern entrance for operational reasons.</p> <p><b>Other comments:</b></p> <p>Support for northern entrance and improved access to Station.</p> <p>Need to improve existing subway as northern entrance to Station would be prone to vandalism and crime.</p> <p>Existing pedestrian underpass should be replaced with a link over the railway.</p> <p>The importance of the Old Warwick Road entrance should not be lost.</p>	<p>requires detailed assessment. Furthermore, it is recognised that there will be additional operational and security issues and costs associated with the creation of a northern entrance that the Station Operator would have to address. There is therefore clearly a need for further detailed assessment of this matter.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the need for further assessment, it is considered important that this is identified within the brief as an objective for the Station Area recognising the opportunity presented by the large scale redevelopment taking place within the surrounding area.</p> <p>In the short term, improvements to the existing underpass should be encouraged through the Station Travel Plan.</p>	
<b>Issue – Land North of the Railway Station</b>		
<p><b>Network Rail and BRB</b> wish land to the north of the Station to be retained for station car parking and this could accommodate improved access to the underpass.</p> <p><b>Chiltern</b> support this land being retained for rail purposes and further consideration should be given to best use of this land relating to access to the station.</p> <p><b>Network Rail Operations</b> supportive of the future development of the Station Area but wish to safeguard land north of the station for future rail use.</p>	<p>The request by the landowner and station operator to retain this area of land for future rail use is noted. This use is acceptable in principle, however, proposals for its rail use need to demonstrate how they relate to other proposals for improving the Station and therefore must be considered as part of the Station Travel Plan.</p>	<p>The brief has been amended to reflect the need for improvements to the safety and attractiveness of the pedestrian/cycle routes to the north. The brief also provides guidance on future development within this area, including the potential for further station car parking and built commercial and residential development.</p>

Comments Made	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<p><b>CLARA/Leamington Society</b> support proposals for a pedestrian route north of the station to Lower Avenue. Introducing some housing could improve security and more detailed work required.</p> <p><b>Other Comments:</b></p> <p>Need to consider provision of land for car parking to the north as well as to the south of the station to meet increased rail usage.</p> <p>The new northern entrance/exit from the Station should open out onto a pedestrianised square.</p> <p>Support for the northern entrance to the station and plans to enhance the landscape within the area to the north of the station. This enhancement should be continued through into York Walk and to the Pump Room Gardens.</p> <p>Need to consider safety and security of use of land to the north of the railway and improved signage.</p> <p>Development to the north of the station must not overlook or dominate the properties on Avenue Road and any open space provision must be safe for people to use.</p> <p>Improve links for pedestrians and cyclists through acquiring adjoining property no.5 Avenue Road and creating a route connecting the existing tunnel under the railway to Avenue Road.</p> <p>Need to consider impact of proposals on existing pedestrian route through the underpass.</p>	<p>Proposals for this area must also enhance the existing route for pedestrians and cyclists from the station, enhance the environment of the area, provide access to Lower Avenue, protect the amenity of the adjoining properties, and safeguard the potential for a northern entrance in the future.</p> <p>The development proposals for this area highlighted in the brief would still be appropriate in the event that the land was no longer required to be held for rail requirements.</p>	<p>The brief has been amended to reflect the need for improvements to the safety and attractiveness of the pedestrian/cycle routes to the north. The brief also provides guidance on future development within this area, including the potential for further station car parking and built commercial and residential development.</p>

**Table 5 Summary of Comments Made in relation to the Land North of the Railway and Council's Response**

Issue Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<b>Issue – Land Uses</b>		
<p><b>Stagecoach</b> comment that having regard to the importance of the bus depot use and guidance on noise sensitive developments, they do not consider residential use on the Quick's site appropriate and therefore the support for the existing Local Plan allocations in the draft brief should be dropped.</p> <p>They support the 'comprehensive residential development' option, subject to relocation by the developer of the bus depot to a suitable location in the vicinity. Implementation is a key issue and re-locating the bus depot cannot be achieved easily and further discussions are necessary with Stagecoach.</p>	<p>The existing allocations, namely employment uses on the Coal Yard depot and commercial/residential uses on the Quick's site, were confirmed in the recently adopted Local Plan. This approach to the redevelopment of the area is still considered deliverable. This is provided the scheme provides a satisfactory relationship between any new residential development and the Stagecoach operation at the detailed design stage and that the development is able to fund the cost of the highway improvements to Station Approach.</p>	<p>The brief has been amended to clarify its support for both options. A section on delivery on how the Council will assist in this process has been included within the 'way forward' section of the brief.</p>
<p><b>Network Rail Infrastructure and BRB</b> state that the office development of the goods yard will be commercially unviable and will not proceed without joint funding (with the developer of the Quick's site) of the highway works to Station Approach and its junctions with Avenue Road. Furthermore, the comprehensive residential option of this area is unachievable and cannot be delivered without clear guidance on delivery and the pro-active assistance of the Council. The brief should assess whether Stagecoach could be relocated onto the former Ford Car Park site or whether there are any alternative sites available.</p> <p>The brief should recognise there is clear market demand for B1 development in this location given the lack of good quality office accommodation in the town and interest shown. The goods yard is also incorrectly shown as an area of ecological potential.</p>	<p>The brief acknowledges that despite efforts over the previous years this has yet to be demonstrated and therefore an alternative option is put forward within the brief.</p> <p>This alternative option is reliant upon the re-location of the Stagecoach operation and it is acknowledged that this will require considerable effort in identifying a suitable alternative site and add to the overall development costs. The Council note the landowners support for the process and the willingness to engage in further discussions. The brief sets out in the 'way forward' section the measures which the Council intends to take to assist in the development process.</p>	



Issue Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
<p><b>Pendragon (owners of the Quick's site)</b> consider that residential uses of the Quick's site may also include sheltered housing within the retirement sector. Other uses that recognise this highly accessible location would also be appropriate, such as a hotel.</p> <p><b>WCC</b> comment that further investigation needed into the relocation of the bus depot to identify a suitable site close to the town centre.</p> <p>If the bus depot remains, commercial uses might be more appropriate.</p> <p>Consider leaving the bus depot in place and surrounding with office development.</p>		
<b>Other Comments Made:</b>		
<b>AWM</b> state that alternative provision must be found for the proposed office development and existing bus depot if it is to be lost to residential development.	Agreed, alternative provision would have to be found and this is recognised within the brief.	No change required.
<p><b>Town Council</b> support housing to the north of the railway line provided it includes a significant proportion of affordable housing and 2/3 bed houses.</p> <p><b>CLARA/Leamington Society</b> support housing to north of the railway line as opposed to apartments and support the approach of 2/3 storey terraced houses with gardens shown in the indicative layout.</p> <p>New dwellings should be consistent with the adjoining buildings and no more than 2 to 3 storey.</p>	Noted. The detail in terms of the quantum of affordable housing and nature of housing provided will be determined in accordance with the Council's policies.	No change required.
No support for residential development due to the noise and air quality levels, and highway constraints. The area would be better used for trade centres and builders merchants displaced from Old Warwick Road.	Residential development would represent an appropriate use of this area, although it is acknowledged that highway, noise and air quality issues will need to be addressed. The use of this land for trade centre uses would not make the best use of this highly accessible location in land use planning terms or provide	No change required.

Issue Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
	the high quality design to improve the appearance of the area. There may also be highway and access issues which would constrain the use of this area for such uses.	
<b>Issue – Design and Quantum of Housing</b>		
<b>Stagecoach</b> considers residential development in this area should seek to achieve higher densities given its accessible location.	The housing density will need to be determined at the detailed planning stage having regard to factors such as the locations accessibility by public transport and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.	No change required.
Support high density development but with little or no parking provision.		
Concern regarding high density development		
<b>Kingdom Hall (Jehovah's Witnesses)</b> express concern as to the proximity of any new properties to the church use and over the creation of a public square adjacent to the church building. Also concerned over increased parking on local roads from new residents.	The design and layout of residential development will be considered at the detailed planning stage and the proposals shown are indicative. Parking will need to be provided in accordance with the Local Plan and the Council's SPD.	No change required.
<b>Other Comments:</b>		
<b>CLARA/Leamington Society</b> do not wish to see major highway changes to the junctions of Station Approach with Avenue Road from new development.	The nature of any highway improvements required to serve the development of this area will need to be considered at the detailed design stage.	No change required.
Improved pedestrian/cycle access to Victoria Park from the new housing should be considered.	Noted. Any improvements would need to be subject to detailed design and feasibility work. However, the potential for a link within the site to Park Drive is identified.  These comments will be passed onto the County Council Highway Planners undertaking the current transport investigations and can inform the delivery phase.	No change required.
Need to provide safe pedestrian links between this area and the retail areas to the south west.		
Proposals should include a cycle link from Princes Drive/Park Drive to the Station through the land to the north of the railway.		
Concern regarding the suitability of the access arrangements and capacity of Avenue Road/York Road and the need to consider alternatives.		

---

Issue Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPG
Existing trees in this area should be protected and new trees planted.	Agreed. This matter will be addressed at the detailed design stage.	No change required.
Need to provide adequate car parking for these homes.	Agreed. Reference is included within the Generic Development Principles. Parking will need to be provided in accordance with the Local Plan and the Council's SPD.	No change required.